FES-1644

Grant & John

Found 2 missing limbs
Perjury (& subornation) in dictors
Oswald FAKE agent
Knew of FBI 11/63 at latest!!
Larry generally says he agreed & it
wants a strain of Red questions as
John feared.
Told me 2 disquieting things.
Spoke to Joan about contract &
said Joan said 50-50 on abt. 5
actions, & improved on what you
said was generous. That is it.
I also think he can & should do it
without advance, which I may
need for typing but Oswald he
insist Ref of my work on this.
And he said you changed your
mind about contract & want
more. Is this why I haven't got-
ten it by mail as you said?
As long as contract says what we
agreed to I am satisfied. But
on Larry's part it has to specify
performance or he served no
purpose. He acted as though
he wanted to buy the 26 vols.
& do what I can doing. No
I think we can beat Lane's
book now, but only if he sits
down & writes fast now

else. If he cannot or will not we can do one of 2 things - get someone else or I'll stop research & write it myself. With the fatigue we have from the great concentration we have put into this, that will not result in the best-written book, but I will get it done. I think he should be able to turn out the book in 30 days from receipt of material. If you agree, get that in contract. If you agree & he still not guarantee this, then I'll do it alone, get my own collaborator, or you get one - or just get a ghost. But there can be no delays. I should have had the contract before revealing anything to Larry. He said he thought you could have the contract drawn by Monday & we could get it signed & agreed to then. I said I could be in NY by noon & could have all or enough of the material by then.

This is a I told him, why I am willing to share.

I don't think this is the kind of a book that requires a "month"

We have lost almost a week on this, which I regret, but it hasn't we can still beat hell & I want with Larry

The contract should specify the way it is to be done, & it should be done as we agreed, in keeping with the agreed title, which he liked & agreed to, The Report on the Warren Report.

It is state what the law is in said and then prove this false by the law's own evidence & to conclude that now the job is to be done, completely, completely in public, possibly by Congress. No speculation, no conjecture, no purple prose, and no private investigations by the writer, Harry or anyone else. Otherwise, we can not get done. If Harry has doubts of the things I say, all of my material has page references.

We have been working up to 5 am both g.m. & how long we can continue I don't know. But we can't waste what we have done with delays.

I think it would speed things up if I knew the provisions of the contract in advance & could, if necessary have my lawyer check them. Harry said he'd call you today & you & he should be able to agree & it could be in the mail tonight. I have to be in D.C. tomorrow & I can give you an address there, my lawyers office - EBW, Jr., Esq. Wash.

Can be less than 500 pages & still do it.

I am giving up what looks like it will amount to a lot of money, and I think in return I should get what I can giving it up for - speed & conformity with what we

now 400 pages now

agreed to.

Index for re-runs - also opening of new material as it is developed

Do I understand my part of contract is standard re: my return, pay, or what?

Target date 1/31/68?

Items - I

Destruction of autopsy notes
" " alleged rifle by

Brennan's description "most probable" source of police ass. description. Police must know source. But without Brennan there is nothing to account for the broadcast description. And he didn't see what he said he saw. So, where did it come from? And if from Brennan, how could police have failed to search that spot immediately?

Pres.'s 1st wound called back wound - p. ____,

12/17 - Marina letter re ~~typing~~ [illegible] ~~test~~ re my [illegible] not paying. [illegible]

~~test~~ re my aff. Given Comm. Judiciary Committee has to bring them.

yet none was ordered. Dep. Sheriff Luke Mooney "hitched" ride & [illegible] about 1 pm, about 1:12 he found cartridge cases, following which (p 79) Capt Fritz was notified in an unspecified way. Fritz in an unspecified way ~~to~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ordered ~~[illegible]~~ instructions that nothing be moved & touched until technicians take photos & fingerprints. Then Lt. Day arrived (at an unspecified time) "and took photographs of the cartridge cases before anything had been moved." How about other photos & fingerprints? It is clear from the context that these things are not listed in chronological order & that Lt Day arrived after the discovery of the rifle at 1:22. On these words if Brennan gave an immediate eye-witness description, it was still about an hour or perhaps more, ~~[illegible]~~ before higher ups were on the scene & there never was an order to search the spot Brennan (& others) described. Fritz (#3, 289) "picked up the cartridge cases, began to examine them" !!! (Mooney) No evidence for were taken of rifle after it was discovered & before it was moved: Pres. all over the place.

(First?) (D) Reference to "found" bullet (p 79) is not footnoted. But on p 81 the moving of the governor from the emergency to the operating room is, & the testimony (VI H 115-16) of nurse Miss Ruth Jeanette Standridge who helped witness governor, saw no bullet, heard none fall, & says Pres was also undressed completely - standard practice. The governor

ITEMS

clothing to Cliff Carter of his staff. After speaking to Hosp. Administrator (p. 18) apparently without notice 55 of FBI not test. These then follows several sentences that do not follow logically, about something being found later in the office of Lone Gray clerk of Texas. We but was found is not indicated. Nurse Jane Carolyn Weston follows VI H 120 10.

D Pat was now with stretcher when wheeled out of operating room. Pr's clothes in paper sacks on bottom of stretcher from which he was transferred to operating table, in hallway outside operating room. She describes things that were on stretcher, how she rolled up sheets, one inside the other (12) & turned it over to orderly R.J. Jimison. Says sheet on which Governor was lying lying had only blood on it. Not asked about bullet. Her testimony had been "briefly" rehearsed (to had 5 minutes) & she had been interviewed at unspecified time by Secret Service.

D Op. Room Technician Mrs Henrietta M. Rios (Mrs H) 6H 123-4. She was on ground outside operating room & saw stretcher under Jimison's control outside Room 3.

D R.J. Jimison, 6H 125 10 Parkland Hosp orderly. He helped transfer Connally from stretcher to operating table & put stretcher in elevator. Saw nothing unusual on stretcher. No bullets. Had been released.

D Darrell C. Tomlinson, senior engineer at Parkland Hosp. 6H 128 60 Had been sent to investigate from assistant to Parkland & saw Removed stretcher & put equipment used near another stretcher. He is uncertain & appears reluctant but he said that after he had occasion to move the stretcher that had been there - not Connally's - he "bumped" it against the wall "& a spent bullet or cartridge rolled out that apparently had been lodged under the edge of the mat." There is not question in his testimony of it, but "mat" means mattress. He & Rios said there was a bumper around the stretcher. How the bullet could have gotten out of Pr. Connally's body & under the mattress of a different stretcher is not addressed. Counsel Specter seems to try & trick him into changing his identification

ITEMS-3

of the stretchers. It may have been an accident, but if so, it was certainly the kind of "accident" the impression needed: also there were times when he was away from the stretchers & the car between the shots & he took casualty stretcher off the elevator & the shots the bullets fell to the floor. When the counsel finishes. Now about the identification of the stretchers, Tomlinson makes a point of saying he isn't changing his story & has no way of knowing what happened to the stretchers if anything, in his absence. When Specter points the secret service agent who interviewed Tomlinson to saying the bullet came from casualty stretcher (and neither stretcher is proved to have been casualty - it is agreed just afterward) Tomlinson still won't change his story. So Specter concentrates on trying to confuse him & gets him to repeat that he just don't one. In ℓ 134 Tomlinson says he doesn't really know what the stretcher he took off the elevator came from!! This is nothing but the story of the "ground" bullet in the Report! The Report misrepresents this testimony in a way that cannot be regarded as accidental.

Even the attempt to get all the witnesses to say what was on the stretchers fails. They don't agree!

D Diane Hamilton Bowron (134ff) emergency room nurse. She took a stretcher to the emergency entrance, helped with Kennedy throughout. Four X-rays are introduced as exhibits. They are not numbered so as is it possible to tell if & where they are printed.

U. Miss Margaret M. Henchcliffe (ℓ 139ff), nurse in emergency room who helped with President. 12 yrs experience. In ℓ 136 she is asked if she saw "any other (than head) wound on President's body" and replied neg at once. No one cried, on for his ass. This wound the other wounds, as Specter knew. She names doctors who were present who are not named in Report (ℓ 141) She says she has had much experience with gunshot wounds. This was an entrance wound, & That she had never seen an exit wound that looked like this one. After she was released, Specter

on the point of Kennedy's wounds

ITEMS-4

Called her back to ask if she had any other information about
gunshot wounds & she said she would remember her
told her a few [illegible] ... soft tissue might make
[illegible] nothing on right temple.

D

Mrs Doris Mae Nelson CH 143-8, nurse; supervisor, emergency
ward Room. Corroborative of what happened in Emergency Room. Also
said a stretcher that had been in that room was removed when
Kennedy brought in. After Kennedy put into casket, the
stretcher was moved out of the Emergency Room, after stuffing

D.

Charles Jack Price, administrator, Parkland Hosp. Had left
(CH 148-52) individuals who participated in the care & treatment of
President Kennedy and Governor Connally... prepare &
submit reports... "Statement entered into record was—
same when in most if not all cases, could have been
drawn only by people who treated them. Dr. Gregory
"corrected" his. Kennedy & Connally originally mis-
identified as persons. Also (p 149) says without any questioning of that he

changed time of President's arrival in emergency room from 12:38 to 12:43

D

Malcolm O. Couch CH 153 ff WFAA-TV news cameraman,
ministerial student. For 5 th 6 cars of motorcade which were
"clipping along" after they turned into Houston & passed Elm
as part of speed. Car 15-20 feet past turn into Houston
at first shot. 50-60 feet past turn into Elm when
he heard 3rd shot. Saw about a dozen people turned as it was
with dozen into building but no person after running from
Bob Jackson, who had seen rifle.

(Did any of these press people notify police of what they saw—
and was they asked if they had by Commission?)

Exposed footage as his car turned into Elm, including frame
shot of Report my Billy, what Commission has. Note lens of
Memorandum for Landsdale? Some of photogs jumped out right
after the car turned into Elm; the Thurs preceded the
driver so he & Bob ran about 75 yds past Elm & heard gunshots
"emerging pictures" of the crowd after he ran back, possibly
including frame shot over 1½ secs after 3rd shot. Enlarge-
ments might show identify the people in front of him & leaving.

Note this: When he was "standing on that little

Items, 5

sidewalk ~~last time~~ between the Book Depository property & the beginning of the parkway." ... "It's there that I saw Ford on the sidewalk." (154) He makes specific identification of this spot where there was an 8-10 inch drainage flood area & is then asked questions I think were intended to confuse him. The distance from the curb is immaterial & requires unnecessary estimates. He located a specific place that required no estimates. At this point the questioner, Asst. Counsel David W. Belin, leaves the subject, without seeking to learn if it could be related to the location of the President's car at the time of his head wound. Very likely because it would have placed the spot embarrassingly close to the first wound location & hurt the Commission's preconceived designs.

Quotes Weitzman (CE 1-TV, re rumor Wise saw Ruby leave Depository 5-10 minutes after assassination. (Check to see if Commission checked this) (Wise not in WC report or deposition)

Says FBI got his statement of 10 seconds lapse between shots wrong - that he has to time his film & shot firing & 10 seconds - "that's a long time". Says 3 more five seconds ~~later~~ at the Carport. Estimate angle of sight when he saw it as "approximately a 45° angle west bound."

(D) (H 162) (6) Tom C. Dillard, Dallas Morning News photographer head of its photographic department. Is a boy, also reporter (44 yrs old) Says car both in process but was to have been closer / as pool press car to cover "spot news" as "prime photographic car" but "be last one past site at the airport." No questions asked by Asst. Commission Counsel Joseph A. Ball. They could see President's car "on very few occasions in high rises in the ground" for the entire trip in town. He identified sounds as rifle shots. Compare with reports, who referred only to "pops", gunfire, etc. Others also identified them as shots & rifle shots - why not reporters?

It goes-6

On p 164 he says he got 2 pictures of the bldg as soon as the third shot was fired. ~~(Doesn't the Report use & refer to only 3 shots.)~~ He had had 2 cameras ready & was watching [illegible] up along route (pictures show secret service agent), "which, of course, is a maximum alone on a parade like that."

He is "a gun nut", has "a great ~~number~~ number of high-powered rifles ... so I know a lot about guns." He said with respect to the origin of the shots "We were getting a sort of reverberation, which made it difficult to pinpoint the actual direction." and "I very definitely smelled gun powder when the car moved up at the corner." Could he have, ~~if he did,~~ smelled gun powder from a 6th floor shot, if he really did smell gun powder? With a "little north wind"? Bell drops this line of questioning right there.

DGH 167 fb

James Robert Underwood, asst news director, KRLD-TV & Radio in photo car with Dillard & others. His camera was [illegible] the motorcade ("I thought it was the fastest motorcade that passed through a crowd; this was really moving ...") was going so fast he couldn't get to stop at a good one with his assistants stationed along the route. He says car was close to Elm when main ~~shot~~ set of shots, which he said sounded like explosives (Dillard says "torpedo") which he attributes to a reverberation (the same word Dillard used). But the second and third shots sounded different & he "realized" they were shots again, as Dillard had. He said of the first "I have heard many rifles fired but it did not sound like a rifle to me." On origin, he specified only that it sounded as though they came from "over head" from the depository. When Jackson said he saw a rifle Underwood looked and saw nothing.

(Travis -)

He ran back and got a camera & ran again to the Depository & saw ~~people~~ "most of the people in the area were running up the grassy slope toward the railway yards" ~~behind~~ the Depository. "I recognized at least a dozen deputy sheriffs running also in that area" He shot some film. He then went back to the Elm & Houston entrance of the Depository and took some pictures of men "going in and out of the bldg." At that time the police had Euins at that door. And he quotes ~~Euins~~ Euins, who saw himself a hero, as telling the police he saw a colored man lean out the window with a rifle. He also says that when closely questioned by the police Euins insisted it was a colored man.

Underwood remained there & took pictures. He says "There was quite a time lapse between the time the shots were fired and the time anyone checked the building". It is clear he meant by this "kept the spectators out" note "out" only - no reference to denying ~~exit~~ EXIT (p. 170) Earlier he had reported taking pictures of men "going in & out of the building." Apparently the Commission didn't credit Underwood or his film & accepted his statement that "during January when things had calmed down" he had checked his films for several days and found no "face in it" that would ~~be important to~~ have been important to this "Why did not the government do this? Is there any excuse for this obvious fault? Could circumstantially!!! And why were not he & Dillard specifically asked if they had reported what they saw to police? And how would police have failed to ask them? Among the other things obvious values of this film to the Commission and the police - and unless the conclusions of Oswald alone was already firmly fixed how could anyone have seen what faces & fires were

why didn't police record Euins' other statements & photograph & report? Questioning from 6 PM to 2 AM!

Haines &

important - was when, by whom, why and
how the building was sealed. At least, I
guess. Is it that the commission report
is not final but it wasn't which would have in
part contradicted Oswald's story of the police?

None of this is referred to in the report,
which is also incorrect in its indexing of
Underwood. (He is briefly mentioned on p. 65, but the
index says 64 & 65) Thus, on p. 64 the commission
states that at 12:35, after speaking to Ellis, Capt
Fritz radioed his report of the assassination
shooting to headquarters, making even
more inexplicable the failure of the police to take
an immediate search & quarantine of the
area & of the commission's failure to note why not.

CH1 Dr. Charles J. Carrico D. by Specter He wants to "open pressure for my hands in general surgery" (Pressure point?) gives different time of alert than in statement. (12:30 vs 12:45?) His descriptive language is not technical (p3) & Specter isn't asked to explain what any of it means, although on p2 he is asked what "agonal" meant. Of the post mortem wound he says "there were no jagged edges." There is persistent prevarication-like questioning about whether he & anyone saw the president's back, and no word other than "back" is used. Again on p4 Specter returns, persistently, to the "back" efforts of the doctors had examined the Pres's clothes, even though Carrico had already explained they had to do just enough just in a desperate effort to save the Pres. During this questioning there is (p4) a clear inference of an effort to brainwash Dr Carrico, to get him to change his testimony before the deposition was begun. He had called the post mortem wound part of entrance. Specter had not made any reference to entrance or exit but was passing M.C. when he doctor spoke of his cursory examination for a single bullet wound. "Now, this certainly would not direct a single bullet entrance"!! On p3 he described the post mortem as "4-7 mm." Which may or may not be the same as the report says "4x7 mm." The quote in the Report is not exact in any event. On p5 Specter gets him to say the post mortem could have been entrance or exit. Then (p6) Specter shows him Exhibit 392 his own statement of 1630 hours 11/22/63, and asks "are the facts set forth in there true & correct?" to which Carrico replies "They are." But in this exhibit Dr Carrico describes the post mortem wound as a "small penetrating wound." When asked if had been previously interrogated Carrico refers to a Secret Service interview shortly after the President's death" (no other description by either Cos) Then Specter again returns to his effort to destroy the doctors first opinion that the post mortem was an entrance wound. Carrico's replies are evasive. He says that they were

asked "what we felt the wounds were from, the direction, and so forth," and Dr. Perry's replies were "Essentially the same as I have (given) here. Said I don't remember specifically." I believe an examining of the Secret Service report will, in fact, show that Carrico was told of the path in the front neck area by Dr. Perry and not Carrico himself. He was ~~prepared~~ released in his ~~bed~~ interview before the taking of the deposition by Specter. He ~~is~~ was asked "Have you ever changed any of your opinions regarding your treatment ~~of~~ and observations of President Kennedy?" and he replies "Not as I recall." This is an obviously false statement (See exhibit 392) into which Specter clearly led him.

Note that on page 5 asked Dr. Carrico for an opinion based on a set of medical circumstances about the President's injuries, and included this "without violating the pleural cavity." Compare this with the apparent source of Specter's medical information, the autopsy Report exhibit 387 on pp 538 ff. At the top of p 542 there is this language referring to "the right pleural cavity — "In this region there is contusion of the parietal pleura and of the extreme apical portion of the right upper lobe of the lung etc. Is this a description of "without violation of the pleural cavity"? Yet this questionably Specter's the basis for Dr. Carrico's answer about the neck wound & the path of the bullet, which "would very likely not tumble, thus producing a small, round, clean wound", etc.

6H78 M. Malcolm Oliver Perry. D. by Specter Perry is Asst. Prof of Surgery at Southwestern Medical School of the U of Texas. When he got to emergency room, Dr. Carrico was already working on Pres. Kennedy Specter is very vague on time, i.e., "shortly after noontime on Nov. 22." (The times fixed by the various medical people as already noted in the analysis of the Report, do not agree). Perry can't say who else was in the emergency room. He said the size of the front neck wound was about 5 mm which he then says was as precise a description as he could give. He asked Dr. Carrico "if this was a wound in his neck or had he begun a tracheotomy." Then he anticipates Specter by saying "I did not turn him over." (Was he too well rehearsed, too cooperative?) P 8 On p. 10 Specter returns to the question of time & misrepresents what Perry said about the time in a transparent effort to place as early as possible a time (Remember the Oswald time reconstruction; remember the obstruction of the events from 12:43 to 12:38 re: arrival?) When Perry volunteers that when he had done what he could do - hope the work on the President was completed & hope he was pronounced dead - he noted he 10 or 15 minutes then went to help with tracheotomy, and that this was around 1:15 or 1:20, also to help to Specter, Specter abruptly changes the line of questioning to get a lengthy explanation in medical terms, to ~~get~~ "the ~~procedures~~ procedures of" "in detail, the procedures" used on the President. He seems to indicate confusing to the entry wound, having seen things that "could be indicative of a wound of the right hemithorax." (p 10). Specter also (willingly & entirely unnecessarily) accepted hearsay. P 10 On the bottom of p 11 Specter says he had earlier asked if ~~from~~ Perry had turned the President over (false - Perry had anticipated Specter) & then asks, again only to establish part of an unfair and inappropriate presentation case,

Perry: "Why did you not turn your over of the conclusion of these operative procedures?" The apparently well-rehearsed Perry replies "I did not have a specific reason... There was nothing further I could do..."
The Truth, as is clear on p. 10 and as Specter clearly knew, is that Perry knew even then! This is a loaded question. It is dishonest. And its only possible purpose is deception. P M Pp 12 & 13 he admits that at a press conference 11/24/63 he said the front neck wound (the only one of which the Dallas doctors knew) could have been an entrance wound. He says this was speculation. This whole thing strikes me as another of the Commission's straw-man devices & if possible the Doctor's testimony should be compared with the TV & radio tapes that should exist. On the more important point of whether the neck was an entrance wound by that bullet he seems to be evasive. P/ He is then asked about a press conference he granted at McAllen, Tex, a few days after the assassination. Again his evasive in answer. Is only "general question, and there is a pretty clear hint that he then said something the Commission is now unhappy about because it conflicts with the Commission's preconception. Specter is careful to draw this after Perry's single, evasive answer. P/ Then Specter goes into the autopsy report and again uses the language "without void of wing the pleural cavity," getting the desired answer from Perry that the description would be "entirely compatible" with what he had seen. The attempt to cover up continues on p 15, where Perry indicates the things he was positive saying were not so & there was nothing Saying them, by inference that the neck wound was of exit nature. He then falsely says he initially described the wound as "between 3 and 5 cm" and "roughly spherical." Certainly, the measurement was much smaller, in M.M.

Perry 3.

On p 16 Perry admits he had 2 conversations with Dr. James J. Humes of Naval Hosp, Bethesda. Although the Commission has always refused to interview witnesses, Perry has uncertain as to first whether ~~the first one~~ This was Friday (as he thought) or Saturday, as Specter insisted, ~~But~~ (His McClellan Press Conference was the following Tuesday) He then decides it was Saturday. He says he also told Dr Humes the Dallas docs had intervened the President's back (Between this statement & the Washington Post story, if the Bethesda docs were looking for a way ~~to~~ claim it was the front neck as an entrance wound, which would have eliminated Oswald, already in custody, as the sole suspect, the Bethesda docs had gone help)

On the top of page 17 Specter asks Perry about a ~~typewritten~~ story in the NY Herald Tribune dealing with the treatment of the President. This story is not described and, as all other references to the press accounts have been treated, is handled with great indefiniteness. Specter asks "Was the content of that story accurate?" and Perry replies "There were certain inaccuracies —" but doesn't say what they were and ~~isn't asked!~~ "or can't"

He was ~~interviewed~~ interviewed on 3 occasions by the Secret Service & says he can't remember the names of the agents on the last 2 occasions asked the name only the first agent, he can't remember that either. Asked if "Does his" any variation in the information which you have given the Federal investigators?" He answered "No, sir; not in essence" and then says "There may have been a variation in wording or sequence..."

He also spoke to 2 FBI men whose names he also doesn't recall. He says they asked "Essentially the same questions in regard to what I might ~~speculate~~ as to the origin of the missiles and their trajectory and

Perry 4 Replied "I have to you that I could not ascertain this of my own knowledge, and described the grounds to the extent I have them." (My emphasis). This is a highly improbable if not false representation of the kind of questions asked of him. They should have wanted fact not speculation, unless they were trying to get him to change the story he had given out. The commission had the notes, dates and what Rogers quoted Perry as saying. None of it is here. It is clear Specter is only trying to patch up whatever he can & then immediately drops it. Specter also had released Perry (page 18) just before the deposition-taking began. He was told to be in Washington 9 am Monday. He also is an amateur hand loader of ammunition.

3H365-390 As Perry appeared before the commission 3/3/64 with Specter again doing the questioning. It soon became clear that he had learned something from Specter in Dallas. For example on p366 he gives a number for the gunshot wounds he has seen, whereas he avoided this on 6H 18. And on 367 he gives Specter the 12:30 time for the call to assistance for the President, which he refused to on 6H 10 even after Specter had there said "... you knew it was 12:30..." On p368 he gives the size of the bone nails wound as 5 mm On this page also Dulles did not know enough about what happened to know that Dr. Carrico, who had just testified, was present. He was, in fact, the first doctor there and Perry had testified had been in charge until Perry arrived.

On p370, in describing his operation, Perry said "at that point I was down in the trachea". ~~Does this~~ Does this indicate the trachea was lower in the President's body than the point at which Perry saw the bullet hole & from which he began the

Perry 5 Parkland Mem? He says he "increased the coverage at the point of the bullet injury. Hence he had a way of proving the path of the bullet, even though he was not asked it (which should have been only too obvious), and even though he denied it at the deposition hearing (CE #1, where he said didn't know the "cause" of the injury at the projecting of absence in the deposition) Is this perjury? Asked the time of death (372) he replied "Approximately 1 o'clock." But on CE #10 he said he had left & washed up & was resting when the President was pronounced dead. On 372 he says of the neck wound "It's edges were neither ragged nor were they punched out but rather clean." On CE #1 he had said "... but the blood obscured any detail about the edges of the wound exactly."

Asked if he can state whether it was an entrance or exit wound (373) he replied "No, sir. I was unable to determine that since I did not ascertain the exact trajectory of the missile." Perhaps it was "keep this part of the sentence from being for the reason he had the requirements of the trajectory (370) the point of entry & not & the point of "bullet injury" to the wound pipe, which he indicated on chest page was, from the front, "down." Arlen Specter then asks him to "assume" certain "facts", and goes into a similar description to that he gave Carrico (CE #5) & Perry (CE #14) but this time adding something missing from those two, after the words "without violating the pleural cavity," with out anything appearing between," but missing the apex of the right pleural cavity and missing the most apical portion of the right lung..."

He estimates the point could have been the exit wound, esp on p 374, in the light of the autopsy report, which he had seen.

On the bottom of this page Perry begins to discuss the press conferences, when asked what was asked at the first press conference, about 2 p.m. 11/22/63, he is again evasive, saying he doesn't recall them "with accuracy" but they were "similar to the questions that were asked here." The answers he gave

"essentially the same, but in my opinion as a result of the questions he asked and how he answered them. He has, again, not asked the obvious question, as at Dallas, implying to be asked, had he said the neck wound was an entry wound with the head wound separate?

Cong. Ford asks if any recordings were made & Specter replies "That was one of the things I was mad about, Mr. Ford." I can imagine just how mad!!! He admits there were tape recorders there (got guess how many!) & FBI present, says "I knew there were recordings made but who made them I don't know." He then gets incoherent. He doesn't once say he tried to find out who had recordings or if anyone did. The networks & local stations were, of course, obvious places & logical ones. A clipping service would reveal any inquiries in the papers, at least on points of agreement, nor does Specter a say he looked in that direction. When Ford asks if there was an "official recording either made by the hospital officials or by the White House people or by any government agency?" Perry answered "Not to my knowledge" and, of course, it can be assumed he had no knowledge. But Specter remained mute. When Ford repeated the question, rephrased, Specter again remained mute. Dulles asks "Was there any reasonably good account in any of the press of this in Parkland?" and Perry says "No, sir." Either he saw little or nothing, or the whole press was wrong, for they all covered it, or he was a liar! Then Ford asks of the reports by the ~~news~~ news media accurate or inaccurate" and Perry replies "In general, they were inaccurate." He reveals a little by saying he was out of town & "didn't ~~read~~ see a lot of them." He doesn't say how or on what he was misquoted.

none

Perry ?

(and they will manage to ~~that~~ avoid answering any specific questions, especially the doctors one. By the bottom of page 376 Perry finally gets specific & complains that the nurses notes merely the wrong shots assigned them.

Then McCloy gets to the neck wound to ask if Kennedy would have survived it. Perry said he didn't even think Kennedy's speech would have been impaired, for the wound was "below the larynx." On the top of 377 McCloy asks if Perry ever talked it over with anyone & Perry replied, "No sir; I did not." But even this close, the crucial question - Perry's - is not asked by anyone.

Later, in the middle of the page McCloy asks if ~~Dr~~ he discussed "with any of the other doctors" at the time "whether this was an exit wound or an entrance wound?" Perry says "Yes, sir; we did at the time." He then evades the answer, without anyone trying to pin him down even to this, which still is not what he told the press. For is a single newspaper, radio or TV version referred to or even hinted at!

~~Spe~~ After an off the record discussion Dulles suggests (bottom of 377) & Specter "if you feel it is feasible, you send to the doctor the accounts of his press conference & press conferences," and that Perry "if you are willing, sir, you could send us a letter ... pointing out .... where you are inaccurately quoted. .... Is that feasible?" Imagine! No direct ask, not under oath, if he feels like, if it is "feasible"!! Perry says it is feasible!! On 378 Perry says "I can & will do this."

Specter then refers to a non-existent part of the Perry deposition (if it refers to McClelland's it is a non-sequitur) relating to a clipping from "La Express," (sic) & the Lafayette "and I questioned the doctors

Perry 8

quoted therein and developed for the record what was true & what was false in the statement attributed to them, so we have conducted what in some circles that not as you suggest to Mr. Perry because we have been trying diligently to get the tape records of the television interviews, but we have been unsuccessful. I discussed this with Mr. Perry in Dallas Wednesday (note - not in the deposition, where the part of the press interviews begins on 6 H 12 & the only paper referred to is on 6 H 17 - the New York Herald Tribune, with no reference to anything it said), and he expressed an interest in seeing them and I told him we would make them available to him prior to his appearance before deposition & before the commission, except on efforts of CBC and NBC, ABC and everyone including New York Dallas and other cities were to be aired." What does this mean?" Last Wednesday" was March 25, 1964, four months after the assassination. Didn't they then know whether or not they could locate the tapes - and it is inconceivable that they couldn't. If they couldn't, why not then in the newspapers? He certainly knew Wednesday, if that is what he said, whether he could have them before Monday, 5 days later. This is a monstrously elaborate ~~straw~~ diversion. Specter then said (and there is nothing omitted from the beginning of the direct quotation above) "The problem is they have not yet catalogued over the footage which they have, and I have been advised by the Secret Service, by Agent John Howlett, that they have in excess of 200 hours of transcripts covering all of the events and they just have not catalogued them and could not make them available" Presumably the "they" here refers to the media, not the Secret Service. Belin then asks "Do you intend to catalogue that"

Specter replied "yes, they do, Mr Dulles. They intend to be back eventually in their normal powers, and the Secret Service is trying to expedite the news media to give us these, and it was our thought to do the film clips, which would be the most direct & the recording which would be the most current, to make comparisons between the reports in the news media and what Dr. Perry said at that time, and the facts which we have from the doctors through our depositions & transcripts today."

Note confusion between Dulles' "you" and Specter's "they" above. Not an accident. And is it conceivable that one gets into Bethesda in N.Y.C. what was left from Dallas on this? Is it conceivable that this business of "cataloguing" was anything but a diversion, an excuse to avoid confronting the doctors with what he had said that was disputed & what the Commission had already decided & try & establish, as best it could?

~~McCloy, Dulles~~ Specter says "it may be a matter of a couple of weeks before they can turn it over." There is then a real discussion following which McCloy & Dulles launch their own diversion, McCloy saying the doctors couldn't be asked to comment on all the things that had been said all around the world and Dulles agreeing, saying" we cannot run down all the rumors or all the facts." What any of this has to do with specific answers & specific questions at our official press conference I cannot see. The doctors still never asked if he said the neck wound was created entrance, as Connie's report did.

There then follows more than a page of general discussion of N.Y. ~~Herald~~ Herald Tribune and Nat.

Perry 10

Evening Post Times Star wasn't accurate, you're dramatic, etc, but never once says what they said that was inaccurate, etc. and is never asked to say what was inaccurate. In fact, what they said, accurate & inaccurate, went unchallenged & admitted by anyone

While on p 377 Perry said "The only people who saw this (autopsy part) wound pictures were Dr. Carrico and myself." he concedes on 381. Dep. Sheriff Boyd said Sgt. M.T. Jenkins displayed he had, Perry concedes he could have. Both ignore Bowron, at least one of whom had already deposed having seen it and being positive it was the 1st autopsy (see ~~Dr. Hamilton~~ Bowron, ~~Col~~ Henchcliffe, 6H 141) Parkland say Dr. Jones also, and Perry concedes the possibility

6H 47-8

~~Bowron~~

On p 384 once again Perry is asked if the President was ever turned over or any time at Parkland, and he replied not to his knowledge (presumably in connection with the autopsy "neck" wound. But the commission ignores ~~that~~ Refers that the President was unbossed, and was at least in part kept for this and other purposes. It has referred to the autopsy wound as a "neck" wound which by ~~inference~~ inference should have been seen if he was raised. But it was, in fact, hidden by both his shirt & his coat.

On p 388 he says the neck (front) wound was not probed & pushed out in any way. When asked if there was any indication "that wound had come from the front" he said "There is no way to tell (sir), for sure" But he also ignores the probabilities. He then says if the bullet had not been deformed the wounds of entrance & exit would not be substantially different.

When on p 384 Dulles goes to the "found" bullet,

Perry 11

spent a day he has that all straightened out," and in fact it came from the stretcher of governor Connally." He then says it was "found in a stretcher" and they have eliminated the possibility it was somebody's stretcher. He doesn't go in to the ~~facts~~ details which indicate the bullet was under the mattress (Tomlinson) and at no point is there any question in my to determine how it could possibly have gotten under the mattress. There was still another stretcher from which it could have come

If anybody at any time came back to the question of the types of interviews, the newspaper & other accounts of what Perry said, there is no indication of it but in anywhere else I have thus far seen. It is not in the Report (naturally). But there has not been cross-referencing between Perry's depositions & test in my hope the Commission. And the clear impression is that he was never confronted with the obvious question.

The question arises: Why was Perry called to Washington before the Commission if not to duplicate what had already been covered in his deposition? Two of the possible answers: Because the Commission had some doubt about whether the entrance neck wound might have been one of entrance, thus destroying its entire "case" (and possibly a ~~st~~ effort to brainwash the Commission); and public comment on the nature of the wound - also opposed to the Commission's position.

~~Note that the two doctors, Jenkins & Jones, & Dr. Henchcliffe, who contended to insist the entrance neck wound was one of entrance, were not called before the Commission! How biased can you get?)~~

3 H 22 '10
Carrico-1

Spector questioning - details of Treatment of Kennedy
at the bottom of p. 361 They go into the neck wound. Dulles asked
where it started and Carrico who called it entrance in his
report said in reply "At the time we did not know — " Size, 5 to
8 mm. no jagged edges. Questioned he says at the time he
did not have "a sufficient basis to form an opinion as to whether
it was an entrance or an exit wound" Of course have been
either. Spector asks him to assume set of circumstances —
his version of the autopsy report — "no violation of pleural
cavity." With these facts, he says it was an exit wound,
a could have been. Then he qualified it further by
saying that he assumed "no other bullet was found."
But we also know there was another bullet "found" and
its source is unknown. It was never established even
as coming from the hastily stretcher, as the Commis-
sion assumes. Also, he says only if "no other bullet was
found," so that even the "finding" of the so-called Con-
nally bullet can be interpreted to mean that Carrico
says, still, that this was an entrance wound.

He had 2 interviews with the Secret Service, one,
roughly, "shortly after the President's death," perhaps a
week later. The agents were concerned over whether
this was an entrance wound & he has given the best opin,
which led him to believe it could have been an exit
wound. Then, questioned, even though on 11/22/63 he
called this an ~~exit~~ entrance wound, he says he has not
changed his "opinion in any way" meaning his "observations
or ~~tests~~ conclusions ..." He mentions his report but
isn't asked what it said.

But on p 365 he admits he hasn't read autopsy
report "carefully. I have seen it. Mr Spector showed me
parts of it ..." & He also says he cannot recall making
any statements to the press in conflict with his
testimony.

C17/2 11, 1111. Kemp 6 H 18 director, neurosurgery, Parkland
(D) His time sequences show him not at site of the Presidents injuries before they happened and put him in the emergency room 13 minutes before he said in his statement (R 516) that the President arrived at the hospital. His handwritten note of 11/22/63 dated 16:15 hrs, says also the incident began at 12:30 pm. Other doctors' statements show Clark was also not part of the scene. On 6 H 20 he is not in his 4 who earlier & preceded him; possibly as many as 7.

11/22/63 Press conf at 2:30 arranged for by White House (K in d 498) He recorded head wound and quotes Perry (6 H 22) as saying he "felt that the (jagged) wound had involved the President's chest." And he says Perry reported the wound "was small and clean so it could have been an entrance wound."

He quotes Perry (6 H 23) as having "stated that he had talked to the Bethesda Naval Hospital on 2 occasions that morning (11/63) and that he knew what the autopsy findings had shown and that he did not wish to be questioned by the press, as he had been asked by Bethesda to confine his remarks to those which he knew from having examined the President, and suggested that the major part of this press ~~conf~~ conference be conducted by me."

But on 6 H 16 Dr Perry had sworn ~~(which was about 5 days later before the Commission)~~ that Mr. Humes "phoned me, of course, that he could not talk to me about any of it and asked me to keep it in confidence, which I did..." Only 5 days later, before the Commission (3 H 380), of the first of 2 calls from Humes, "He advised me that he could not discuss with me the findings of autopsy ..." This would seem to involve both perjury & the subornation of perjury. It makes some sense of the treatment of Perry both in deposition and before the Commission. If Dr Perry, Carrico and others had been wrong about the entrance wound, there was no reason why they could not have just come out and admitted

Clark

it. Or ~~Hoo~~ government officials ~~could~~ could have done so. And why should Perry have lied about what Hermes told him? Is it possible that, if this is perjury, he committed perjury entirely on his own initiative at the risk of jail and a ruined career, and perhaps a unique niche in the annals of infamy?

And keep this. Peter & Shiras may have been present when Perry made his statement.

Connally was unsure until a chest autopsy (p24)

On p26 Specter asks Kemp to identify 2 statements he made - the only ~~one~~ ~~Dec 1 which was handwritten (R524-5)~~ ~~and is dated 11/22/63, 1615 hrs (4:15 p.m.)~~ ones he made Clark said. Specter said of one "I now show you ~~a 2¾ page~~ the second and third sheets, which purport to be the summary made by you and ask if this was prepared by you?" And of the second Specter said "and I now show you a 2¾ page summary which purports to bear your signature, being dated Nov 22, 1963, and I ask you if that in fact is your signature?" Then Specter asks, "and was, in fact, this report made in your own hand..." See Clark's responses confirm Specter's questions.

But the facts are otherwise. There is a 2-page hand-written report, signed, dated Nov. 22, 1963, 1615 hrs. (R516-8) There is also a typed document (R524-5), not in Clark's "own hand," about which there is some mystery. It is, in fact, not dated. It is signed. The third page is numbered 2, and the second page, which appears to be the first, is numbered 1. The first page ~~of~~ is not complete and is ~~about~~ less than a half page, with the word "statement" written in a neat hand in the upper right. The rest of the sheet has been cut off and the ~~re~~ reproduction shows only the first of the

page with typing. It seems to be in a different typing than the other 2 pages. It is this part which begins with the statement that the President arrived at exactly 12:43 p.m. The second page has a heading, "Summary." This also is one of the cases the time of 12:43 was not changed to 12:38, which part of the rumors could have meant certain is not to be destroyed.

Clark ~~he~~ had earlier been interviewed by both the FBI & Secret Service twice. On one occasion the Secret Service asked if he had a copy of the written report submitted by M. Ronald Jones, and I told him that I did not."

Copies of all the reports of all the doctors were kept under lock & key at the hospital. It seems unlikely that the Secret Service was in need of the report. In view of the fact that after a knife (3 H 381) Mr. Jones ~~indicated the entrance wound was not accurate, but~~ the continued use of this that the Secret Service wanted no copies ~~done~~ done

He also was released

Clark was questioned by Aff. again 4 days later. 3/25/64 He is asked whether he ever made statements quoted from the translation of an article from the 2/20/64 issue of "L'Express" which in turn quotes the New York Times of 11/27/63 as its source. One is on the entrance wound as that of entrance. He doesn't deny hearing said it. He just says he doesn't recall having said it (6 H 28) He also says M. Perry "assumed" the "penetration of the missile into the chest." This addition also released.

P 6 H 45-51

Dr Marion Thomas Jenkins 3/25/64, anesthetist. He saw the neck wound "before the tracheotomy was performed." (647) He says he should have put into his report that it was cut because it was not "clearly demarcated, round, punctuate" as those of entrance usually are. He had only a glance at it

But on 651 he said that at the time of the emergency he had thought that the one bullet must have traversed his pleura, must have gotten into his lung cavity, his chest ~~cavity~~ cavity, I mean ..." Didn't this mean, since he knew of no back wound, that he really thought the neck wound was of entrance? Released.

(D)
CH 51-57

Dr. Ronald Coy Jones 3/26/64, Resident physician in Gen. Surgery at Parkland. Saw entrance neck wound (H53) "no greater than a quarter of an inch in greatest diameter..." and it was "just above the suprasternal notch." In his report at the time of the emergency he had

(CH 55)

said ~~the neck wound I thought~~ of the neck wound "... thought to be a bullet entrance wound." If it had been of exit "you would think that it exited at a very low velocity to produce no more damage than this had done ...." It would be "consistent ... with an exit wound" only if "a very low velocity to the point that you might think that this bullet ~~had~~ barely made it ~~it~~ through the soft tissues and just enough to drop out of the skin on the opposite side." He saw as many cases of bullet wounds as "4 or 5 a night. Released.

6H57-60 Dr. Don Ted Curtis, "oral surgeon resident. licensed dentist. Didn't see "nature of the wounds" when he entered - just auto of Gov Connie. He alone so far of the docs, said he didn't discuss the neck wound with other docs. Released.

D 4H61-63 Dr. FOUAD A. BASHOUR 3/25/64 asst professor, cardiology Saw nothing of neck wound. Didn't know what he did Secret Service asked him, as it appeared, asked each docs, if they had any memoranda of any thing else than in their reports. Released.

6H 63-68 Dr Gene Coleman Colvin 3/25/64, ~~anast~~ anesthesiologist. Didn't see neck wound until after Tracheotomy. Called it "punctuate wound" and "the thought raced through my mind that this might have been an entrance wound" (H.65) But he also thought it could have been exit wound. Released.

D-6H68-72 Dr. Paul Conrad Peters. 3/24/64. asst. Prof Urology. Kennedy had arc bandage under brace, figure-8 wrist, around lower pelvis & both thighs. Didn't see neck wound. Released.